

1
2
3 Places in the brain: Bridging layout and object geometry in scene-selective cortex
4
5

6 **Abbreviated Title:** Bridging layout and object geometry in scene-selective cortex
7
8

9 **Authors and addresses:**

10 Moira R. Dillon*¹, Andrew S. Persichetti*², Elizabeth S. Spelke¹, & Daniel D. Dilks²

11 *These authors contributed equally to this work and are listed alphabetically

12 ¹Department of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

13 ²Department of Psychology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30309
14
15
16

17 **Corresponding author and address (including email):**

18 Daniel D. Dilks

19 Department of Psychology

20 Emory University

21 36 Eagle Row

22 Atlanta, GA 30322

23 dilks@emory.edu
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Diverse animal species primarily rely on sense (left-right) and egocentric distance (proximal-distal) when navigating the environment. Recent neuroimaging studies with human adults show that this information is represented in two scene-selective cortical regions – the retrosplenial complex (RSC) and occipital place area (OPA) – but not in a third scene-selective region – the parahippocampal place area (PPA). What geometric properties, then, does the PPA represent, and what is its role in scene processing? Here we hypothesize that the PPA represents relative length and angle, the geometric properties classically associated with object recognition, but only in the context of large extended surfaces that compose the layout of a scene. Using functional magnetic resonance imaging adaptation, we found that the PPA is indeed sensitive to relative length and angle changes in pictures of scenes, but not objects that reliably elicited responses to the same geometric changes in object-selective cortical regions. Moreover, we found that the OPA is also sensitive to such changes, while the RSC is tolerant to such changes. Thus, the geometric information typically associated with object recognition is also used during some aspects of scene processing. These findings provide evidence that scene-selective cortex differentially represents the geometric properties guiding navigation versus scene categorization.

Keywords: Scene Recognition, Object Recognition, Parahippocampal Place Area (PPA), Retrosplenial Complex (RSC), Occipital Place Area (OPA)

1
2
3 Our abilities to navigate the environment and to recognize the objects in it are essential to our
4 survival. Over the past two decades, an abundance of research has elucidated the geometric
5 information guiding navigation and object recognition in animals from insects to mammals, and
6 in humans from infants to adults. Humans and many other animals navigate by encoding the
7 “sense” (left-right) relations and egocentric (proximal-distal) distances of large extended surfaces
8 in the environment, but not the relative lengths of these surfaces or the angles at which they meet
9 (e.g., Lee et al. 2012, 2013; O’Keefe and Burgess 1996; see Cheng and Newcombe 2005, and
10 Spelke and Lee 2012 for reviews). By contrast, humans and many other animals recognize and
11 categorize objects by the relative lengths and angles that define their 2D or 3D structure, rather
12 than by their positions relative to the observer (e.g., Dehaene et al. 2006; Izard and Spelke 2009).
13 Further, recent functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies with human adults have
14 shown that two scene-selective regions – the retrosplenial complex (RSC) (Maguire 2001) and
15 the occipital place area (OPA) (Dilks et al. 2013) – are sensitive to the sense and egocentric
16 distance properties guiding navigation (Dilks et al. 2011; Persichetti and Dilks 2016).
17 Surprisingly, however, a third scene-selective region — the parahippocampal place area (PPA)
18 (Epstein and Kanwisher 1998) – is not sensitive to either sense or egocentric distance,
19 challenging its role in navigation (Ghaem et al. 1997; Janzen and van Turenout 2004; Cheng
20 and Newcombe 2005; Rosenbaum et al. 2004; Rauchs et al. 2008; Spelke et al. 2010). What
21 geometric information, then, does the PPA represent, and what role might it play in scene
22 processing? We hypothesize that the PPA represents the shape-defining properties of relative
23 length and angle in a scene, and in doing so, might play a role in scene categorization (e.g.,
24 recognizing a place as a kitchen or a beach).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Prior studies have demonstrated that the PPA represents the “shape” of a scene, often referred to as its “spatial layout.” For example, the PPA discriminates between open and closed spatial layouts (e.g., a desert versus a forest; Kravitz et al. 2011; Park et al. 2011) and responds more strongly to intact spatial layouts (e.g., empty apartment rooms) than to fragmented ones in which the walls, floors, and ceilings have been fractured and rearranged (Epstein and Kanwisher 1998; Kamps et al. 2016a). Nevertheless, these are gross definitions of a scene’s “shape,” and whether sensitivity to shape in the PPA also includes the simple relative lengths and angles in a layout remains unknown. A behavioral study may provide some clues: Walther and Shen (2014) found that participants’ ability to categorize scenes was significantly impaired when contour junctions (i.e., angle), and to a lesser extent, contour lengths were removed, and they conjectured that perhaps activity in the PPA represents such information. Here we directly test *whether* the PPA, as well as the other scene-selective regions, the OPA and the RSC, represent the “shape” of a scene by the relative lengths and angles that define its extended surfaces. In addition, we test *how* these three regions represent such information by measuring their sensitivity to isolated changes in relative length or angle.

To test whether and how the PPA and the other scene-selective regions represent relative length and angle, we used an event-related fMRI adaptation paradigm (Grill-Spector and Malach 2001) in human adults. Specifically, participants viewed two successively presented pictures of the same scene, of completely different scenes, or of two scenes that differed by a relative length and/or angle change. If regions of scene-selective cortex (PPA, OPA, and RSC) are sensitive to the relative length and angle properties of scenes, then the pictures presenting such shape changes will be treated as different, and fMRI adaptation will not occur. If, in contrast, those

1
2
3 regions are tolerant to changes to the relative length and angle properties of scenes, then pictures
4
5 with those changes may be treated as the same, and fMRI adaptation will occur.
6
7

8 **Materials & Methods**

9

10 *Participants.* Twenty-five healthy adults (ages 20-36; 11 females) participated in this
11
12 experiment. All participants gave informed consent and had normal or corrected-to-normal
13
14 vision. One participant was excluded due to excessive motion; we thus report the results from the
15
16 remaining 24 participants.
17

18
19 *Design.* First, we used a region of interest (ROI) approach, in which we localized scene-selective
20
21 cortical regions (localizer runs). Then, we used an independent set of experimental runs to
22
23 investigate the responses of these regions to pairs of pictures of scenes that were identical,
24
25 entirely different, or differed by the relative lengths of surfaces and/or the angles at which
26
27 surfaces met. Object stimuli were also included to test whether any sensitivity to relative length
28
29 and angle in scene-selective regions was specific to pictures of scenes or generalized to pictures
30
31 of objects. Finally, we investigated whether object-selective regions were sensitive to relative
32
33 length and angle changes in these same pictures of scenes and objects.
34
35
36
37

38
39 For the localizer runs, ROIs were identified using a standard method (described
40
41 previously in Epstein and Kanwisher 1998). Each participant completed two localizer runs. In a
42
43 blocked design, participants saw pictures of faces, objects, scenes, and scrambled objects. Each
44
45 run was 336 s long and consisted of four blocks per stimulus category. The order of the stimulus
46
47 category blocks in each run was palindromic (e.g., faces, objects, scenes, scrambled objects,
48
49 scrambled objects, scenes, objects, faces, etc.) and was pseudo-randomized across runs. Each
50
51 block contained 20 pictures from the same category for a total of 16 s blocks. Each picture was
52
53 presented for 300 ms, followed by a 500 ms interstimulus interval (ISI). We also included five 16
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 s fixation blocks: one at the beginning; three in the middle interleaved between each palindrome;
4
5 and one at the end of each run. Participants performed a one-back task, responding with a button
6
7 press every time the same picture was presented twice in a row.
8
9

10 For the experimental runs, participants completed ten runs each with 100 experimental
11 trials (50 “scene” trials and 50 “object” trials, interleaved), and an average of 44 fixation trials,
12 which were used as a baseline condition. Each run was 390 s long. On each fixation trial, a white
13 cross (subtending 0.5° of visual angle) was displayed on a gray background. On each
14 experimental trial, a picture of either a scene or an object was presented for 300 ms, followed by
15 a 400 ms ISI, followed by another picture in the same stimulus category for 300 ms. After the
16 presentation of the second picture, there was a jittered interval ranging from 1-6 s (3 s on
17 average). Each pair of pictures consisted of one of the following: (1) the same picture presented
18 twice (Same condition); (2) two completely different pictures from the same category (Different
19 condition); (3) a picture followed by that same picture but with a change in both its relative
20 length and angle properties (Length and Angle condition [L/A condition]); (4) a picture followed
21 by that same picture but with a relative length change only (Length condition); or (5) a picture
22 followed by that same picture but with an angle change only (Angle condition) (**Figure 1**). In
23 total, each participant viewed 100 trials of each condition (Same, Different, L/A, Length, and
24 Angle) for each picture type. The trial sequence was generated by the Free-Surfer optseq2
25 function, optimized for the most accurate estimations of the hemodynamic response (Burock et
26 al. 1998; Dale et al. 1999).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 All stimuli subtended $9^\circ \times 7^\circ$ of visual angle, and stimuli in the same category were the
51 same color (**Figure 1**). Participants were instructed to keep their eyes fixated on the white cross
52 that appeared in the center of the screen between each picture. After pictures appeared at the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 central fixation, they moved 1° of visual angle to either the left or right. Participants performed
4 an orthogonal task, indicating by a button press whether the pictures within a pair were moving
5 in the same or opposite directions. This motion task was chosen to eliminate possible early
6 retinotopic confounds and to further disrupt the potential perception of navigating through the
7 scenes.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 *Stimuli.* All scene and object pictures were created from a set of six parallelograms. Two of these
16 parallelograms had a side-length ratio of 1:1.33, three had a side-length ratio of 1:1.66, and one
17 had side-length ratio of 1:1.99. Three parallelograms (one at each side-length ratio) had
18 supplementary angles of 135° and 45° , two (at 1:1.33 and 1:1.66 side-length ratios) had
19 supplementary angles of 105° and 75° , and one (at the 1:1.66 side-length ratio) had
20 supplementary angles of 120° and 60° . This set of parallelograms afforded three groups of three
21 pictures: one group that differed in both types of shape properties (L/A condition); one group
22 that differed in relative length only (Length condition); and one group that differed in angle only
23 (Angle condition). These three sets of stimuli allowed us to evaluate responses to combined
24 changes to relative length and angle as well as to specific geometric shape properties (i.e.,
25 relative length only, or angle only). Specifically, we first examined whether each ROI was
26 sensitive to combined changes to relative length and angle, and, if so, then asked how relative
27 length and angle might contribute separately to this sensitivity to the combined changes.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 One set of scene pictures was formed by posing each parallelogram as the back wall of a
47 2D projection of a 3D space, where the corners of the parallelogram were extended forward, in
48 perspective, towards the picture plane. The other set of scene pictures was created using the same
49 method, but the back-wall parallelogram was altered by adding a triangle on the left and right
50 sides to form a hexagon. Both parallelogram and hexagon pictures of scenes were used for the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Same, L/A, Length, and Angle conditions. The Different condition consisted of trials in which a
4
5 parallelogram scene was either preceded or followed by a hexagon scene, with these scenes
6
7 additionally always differing in relative length and angle. Object pictures used the same
8
9 parallelogram and hexagon templates, but perspectival depth was projected backwards in the
10
11 picture plane, to form freestanding “boxes” in an otherwise empty picture. The scene pictures
12
13 were designed to look like nondescript indoor rooms that contained a door, a mirror, and a
14
15 hanging light. The object pictures were designed to resemble mail packages that contained three
16
17 stickers. Importantly, the distance between the front edge of the picture and the back wall of the
18
19 room, and the distance between the front edge of the picture and the package, were held constant
20
21 so that the rooms and objects never changed in their egocentric distance relative to the viewer
22
23
24
25
26
27 **(Figure 1).**

28
29 For each condition (except the Same condition), there was a small change in the area of
30
31 the primary shape defining the scene or object between the pair of pictures in each trial.
32
33 However, independent samples *t*-tests comparing the area changes between every combination of
34
35 picture pairs within each condition revealed no significant differences in area changes across the
36
37 conditions (all *p*-values > 0.14). This result suggests that any neural differences across condition
38
39 were not due to area changes, but rather due to relative length and/or angle changes.
40
41
42

43
44 *fMRI scanning.* Scanning was completed on a 3T Siemens Trio scanner at the Facility for
45
46 Education and Research in Neuroscience (FERN) at Emory University (Atlanta, GA). Functional
47
48 images were acquired using a 32-channel head matrix coil and a gradient echo single-shot echo
49
50 planar imaging sequence. Sixteen image slices were acquired for both the localizer scans
51
52 (repetition time = 2 s), and the experimental scans (repetition time = 1 s). These slices were
53
54 oriented approximately between perpendicular and parallel to the calcarine sulcus, covering the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occipital and temporal lobes and the lower portion of the parietal lobe. For all scans: echo time =
4
5 30 ms; voxel size = 3.1 mm x 3.1 mm x 4.0 mm, with a 0.4 mm interslice gap. For each
6
7 participant, whole-brain, high-resolution T1 weighted anatomical images were acquired for
8
9 registration of the functional images.
10
11

12 *Data analysis.* fMRI data analysis was conducted using the FSL software (Smith et al. 2004) and
13
14 custom MATLAB code. Before statistical analysis, data from the experimental runs were skull-
15
16 stripped (Smith 2002), registered to participants' T1 weighted anatomical image, motion
17
18 corrected using FSL's MCFLIRT tool (Jenkinson et al. 2002), and spatially smoothed with a 6
19
20 mm kernel. We then conducted analyses on the resultant preprocessed time courses. Following
21
22 the methods of previous studies (Grill-Spector et al. 1999; Kourtzi and Kanwisher 2001; Dilks et
23
24 al. 2011; Persichetti and Dilks 2016), the experimental trials were separated by condition for
25
26 each picture type. Next, for each condition and each picture type, we selected a time-series
27
28 window from the trial onset to 12 s after onset, and then calculated a mean response for each
29
30 participant. Finally, the mean response to each condition was compared to a fixation baseline,
31
32 thus computing percent signal change. The fixation baseline for each participant was identified
33
34 by averaging the one-second fixation that preceded the onset of each experimental trial (we
35
36 deliberately chose this one-second window to avoid overlapping the previous trial when the
37
38 jittered inter-trial interval was equal to one second). Localizer data, but not experimental data,
39
40 were de-trended and then fit with a general linear model that contained covariates that were
41
42 convolved with a double-gamma function to approximate the hemodynamic response function.
43
44 After this preprocessing, the scene-selective regions – PPA, OPA, and RSC – were bilaterally
45
46 defined in each participant as those regions that responded more strongly to scenes than to
47
48 objects ($p < 10^{-4}$, uncorrected; as in Epstein and Kanwisher 1998). Each scene-selective ROI was
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 identified in at least one hemisphere for all 24 participants. Object-selective regions – the lateral
4 occipital sulcus (LO) and the posterior fusiform sulcus (pFs) – were bilaterally defined in all
5 participants for LO, and in 20 of the 24 participants for the pFs, as those regions that responded
6 more strongly to objects than to scrambled objects ($p < 10^{-4}$, uncorrected) (Grill-Spector et al.
7 1998). As a control region, we also anatomically defined an Early Visual Cortex (EVC) ROI
8 bilaterally in each participant that corresponded to the entirety of V1 (fovea and periphery) using
9 the Jülich histological atlas in FSL (Amunts et al. 2000). For each ROI of each participant, the
10 mean time courses of responses for the experimental conditions (Same, Different, L/A, Length,
11 and Angle) for each picture type were extracted across voxels.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Next, the response time courses were averaged across all conditions (Same, Different
26 L/A, Length, and Angle) for only the scene stimuli, all scene-selective ROIs, and all participants
27 to identify an average response across “peak” time points. A peak response window was then
28 defined by the whole-second interval in which responses were significantly greater than zero
29 (i.e., the fixation baseline), resulting in a window from 5 s – 9 s (all p -values < 0.05). The same
30 method was used to find the peak time points for only the object stimuli in object-selective ROIs,
31 resulting in a window from 6 s – 10 s (all p -values < 0.05). Finally, for each participant, we
32 extracted the average activation within each time window for each scene- and object-selective
33 ROI for each picture type (scenes or objects) and each condition (Different, Same, L/A, Length,
34 and Angle). In each ROI and for each picture type, a 2 (Hemisphere: Left, Right) x 5 (Condition:
35 Different, Same, L/A, Length, Angle) repeated-measures ANOVA was performed, and none
36 revealed a significant Hemisphere x Condition interaction (all p values > 0.10). Thus, data from
37 each hemisphere were collapsed for all further analyses.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Results

56
57
58
59
60

Scene-selective cortex

Our first main analysis investigated *whether* combined changes to relative length and angle (i.e., L/A changes) in pictures of scenes are represented in each scene-selective ROI. As predicted, we found that the PPA was sensitive to L/A changes in pictures of scenes (**Figure 2**). In the PPA, a 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA on the average response between 5 s and 9 s revealed a significant main effect of Condition ($F_{(2,46)} = 5.82, p < 0.01, \eta_p^2 = 0.20$), with a greater response to the Different and L/A conditions compared to the Same condition (main effect contrasts, both p values < 0.05 , both Cohen's d s > 0.54). There was no significant difference between the Different and L/A conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.20$, Cohen's $d = 0.31$). These results demonstrate the expected fMRI adaptation (i.e., Different $>$ Same) as well as the predicted sensitivity to combined changes to relative length and angle in pictures of scenes (i.e., L/A $>$ Same) in the PPA.

We also found that the OPA was sensitive to L/A changes in pictures of scenes (**Figure 2**). A 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Condition ($F_{(2,46)} = 6.55, p < 0.005, \eta_p^2 = 0.22$), with a greater response to the Different and L/A conditions compared to the Same condition (main effect contrasts, both p values < 0.005 , both Cohen's d s > 0.77). There was no significant difference between the Different and L/A conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.85$, Cohen's $d = 0.05$). These results demonstrate the expected fMRI adaptation effect (i.e., Different $>$ Same) as well as a sensitivity to combined changes to relative length and angle in pictures of scenes (i.e., L/A $>$ Same) in the OPA.

Unlike the OPA and PPA, the RSC was tolerant to L/A changes in pictures of scenes (**Figure 2**). A 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a

1
2
3 significant main effect of Condition ($F_{(2,46)} = 3.26, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.12$), with a significantly
4 greater response to the Different condition compared to the Same condition (main effect contrast,
5
6 $p < 0.05$, Cohen's $d = 0.70$), a marginal difference between the Different and L/A conditions
7
8 (main effect contrast, $p = 0.10$, Cohen's $d = 0.51$), and no significant difference between the L/A
9
10 and Same conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.38$, Cohen's $d = 0.28$). These results
11
12 demonstrate the expected fMRI adaptation effect (i.e., Different > Same) in the RSC, but no
13
14 clear sensitivity to L/A information in pictures of scenes (i.e., L/A \approx Same). Although the
15
16 marginal difference between the L/A and Different conditions suggests that the RSC is not
17
18 totally insensitive to L/A changes in pictures of scenes, it nonetheless shows a tolerance to these
19
20 changes – i.e., no significant difference between the L/A and Same conditions – in contrast to the
21
22 PPA and OPA.
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The above analyses suggest that the three scene-selective cortical regions respond to L/A
30 changes in pictures of scenes differently. To directly test this suggestion, we compared responses
31 across the three ROIs (**Figure 3**). A 3 (ROI: PPA, OPA, RSC) x 3 (Condition: Different, L/A,
32 Same) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant ROI x Condition interaction ($F_{(4,92)} =$
33 $2.68, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.10$). There was no significant difference in response between the Same
34 and Different conditions across any of the ROIs, indicating that all three scene-selective regions
35 showed the expected adaptation effect to a similar degree (interaction contrasts, all $ps > 0.15$, all
36 $\eta_p^2s < 0.09$). In contrast, comparison of the L/A and Same conditions revealed a greater
37 difference between these conditions in the PPA relative to the RSC (interaction contrast, $p <$
38 $0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.18$), a marginal difference between these conditions in the OPA relative to the RSC
39 (interaction contrast, $p = 0.10, \eta_p^2 = 0.11$), and no significant difference between these conditions
40 in the PPA relative to the OPA (interaction contrast, $p = 0.97, \eta_p^2 < 0.001$). Taken together, these
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 results demonstrate that the PPA and OPA represent the combined changes to relative length and
4 angle in scenes differently from the RSC, with the PPA and OPA sensitive to such changes and
5
6 the RSC tolerant to such changes.
7
8

9
10 Are these responses to L/A changes in the PPA and OPA (and in the RSC, since it is
11 tolerant, not totally insensitive to such changes) specific to pictures of scenes, or might these
12 ROIs respond to any L/A changes regardless of whether they are presented in the context of
13 scenes? To address this question, we measured the response to L/A changes in pictures of objects
14 in each ROI. A 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA on the
15 average response to pictures of objects from 5 s to 9 s revealed no significant main effect of
16 condition in any of the scene-selective ROIs (all p values > 0.15 , all η_p^2 s < 0.08). Thus, none of
17 the scene-selective ROIs even showed the expected adaptation effect (i.e., Different $>$ Same) to
18 object stimuli, revealing a qualitatively different pattern of activation to pictures of objects
19 versus pictures of scenes. These results suggest that the sensitivity to combined changes to
20 relative length and angle in the PPA and the OPA is specific to pictures of scenes.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Might the sensitivity to L/A changes in pictures of scenes in the PPA and OPA be due to
37 a feed-forward effect from earlier visual areas, rather than to a sensitivity intrinsic to each area?
38 We do not think this could be the case because participants were asked to fixate while the stimuli
39 were moving across the fovea, thus disrupting early retinotopic representations. Nevertheless, we
40 directly addressed this question by asking whether L/A changes in our stimuli were represented
41 in an anatomically defined EVC ROI. A 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-
42 measures ANOVA on the average response to pictures of scenes from 5 s to 9 s revealed that the
43 EVC did not even show the expected fMRI adaptation effect (i.e., Different $>$ Same; $F_{(2,46)} =$
44 0.47 , $p = 0.63$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.02$), thus revealing a qualitatively different pattern of activation in the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 EVC than in the scene-selective cortex. These results suggest that the sensitivity to combined
4
5 changes to relative length and angle in scenes is not due to adaptation in the early visual areas for
6
7 either the PPA or the OPA.
8
9

10 Our second main analysis investigated *how* relative length and angle might contribute
11
12 separately to the response to the combined changes to relative length and angle across scene-
13
14 selective cortex, observed in our first analysis. Despite its tolerance to combined changes to
15
16 relative length and angle compared to the PPA and OPA, we included the RSC in this analysis
17
18 because the RSC might nevertheless still be sensitive to changes in relative length alone or to
19
20 angle alone, when other geometric properties are equated. Since we are interested in how
21
22 changes to relative length only and angle only combine to explain the response to the changes in
23
24 both relative length and angle (i.e., L/A change), the crucial comparison is between the isolated
25
26 changes (i.e., Length, Angle), the combined change (i.e., L/A), and the Same condition. (We still
27
28 included the Different condition in our analysis for completeness, even though it is irrelevant to
29
30 how the responses to the isolated changes combine to equal the response to the combined
31
32 change.) Thus, if relative length alone is driving sensitivity to L/A changes, then the response to
33
34 the Length changes will look like the L/A condition and will differ from the Angle and Same
35
36 conditions. By contrast, if angle alone is driving sensitivity to L/A changes, then the response to
37
38 the Angle changes will resemble the L/A condition and differ from the Length and Same
39
40 conditions. Other patterns (e.g., Length and Angle somewhere in between both the L/A and
41
42 Same conditions) would suggest that both geometric properties underlie cortical responses to
43
44 combined changes in relative length and angle.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 We found evidence that both types of information in combination underlie sensitivity to
53
54 L/A changes in the PPA: A 5-level (Condition: L/A, Length, Angle, Same, Different) repeated-
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Condition ($F_{(4,92)} = 2.74, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 =$
4
5 0.11), with a greater response to both the L/A and Different conditions compared to the Same
6
7 condition (main effect contrasts, both p 's < 0.05 , Cohen's d 's > 0.54), consistent with the PPA's
8
9 sensitivity to L/A changes, as reported in our first analysis. Next, the response to the Length
10
11 condition was marginally greater than the Same condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.06$,
12
13 Cohen's $d = 0.42$), and not significantly different from either the L/A or Different conditions
14
15 (main effect contrasts, both p -values > 0.20 , Cohen's d 's < 0.38), while the response to the Angle
16
17 condition was not significantly different from the Same condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.22$,
18
19 Cohen's $d = 0.36$), marginally different from the L/A condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.06$,
20
21 Cohen's $d = 0.48$), and not significantly different from the Different condition (main effect
22
23 contrast, $p = 0.49$, Cohen's $d = 0.17$). These results could suggest that relative length alone, but
24
25 not angle alone, drives responses to L/A changes in the PPA. Crucially, however, there was no
26
27 difference between the Length and Angle conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.81$, Cohen's $d =$
28
29 0.07): If relative length or angle alone were driving the response to combined length and angle,
30
31 the response to the isolated changes to relative length and angle would differ from each other.
32
33 Thus, taken together, these results reveal that the response to the Length and Angle conditions
34
35 were somewhere in between the L/A and Same conditions, suggesting that both relative length
36
37 and angle modulate the activity of the PPA.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Similar findings emerged from the analyses of the OPA. A 5-level (Condition: L/A,
47
48 Length, Angle, Same, Different) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect
49
50 of Condition ($F_{(4,92)} = 3.79, p < 0.01, \eta_p^2 = 0.14$), with a greater response to both the L/A and
51
52 Different conditions compared to the Same condition (main effect contrasts, both p -values $<$
53
54 0.01, Cohen's d 's < 0.96), consistent with the OPA's sensitivity to L/A changes, as reported in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 our first analysis. Next, the response to the Length condition was marginally greater than the
4 Same condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.06$, Cohen's $d = 0.53$), and not significantly different
5 from the L/A or Different conditions (main effect contrasts, both p -values > 0.19 , Cohen's d 's $<$
6 0.26), while the response to the Angle condition was marginally different from both the Same
7 condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.10$, Cohen's $d = 0.35$) and the L/A condition (main effect
8 contrast, $p = 0.07$, Cohen's $d = 0.47$), and significantly different from the Different condition
9 (main effect contrast, $p < 0.05$, Cohen's $d = 0.61$). Finally, there was no difference between the
10 Length and Angle conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.53$, Cohen's $d = 0.21$). Taken together,
11 these results suggest that the OPA, like the PPA, responds to both relative length and angle.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 By contrast, we did not find clear evidence for sensitivity to any shape changes (L/A,
25 Length, or Angle) in the RSC. A 5-level (Condition: L/A, Length, Angle, Same, Different)
26 repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a marginal main effect of Condition ($F_{(4,92)} = 2.27$, $p =$
27 0.07 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.09$). Note, however, that the marginal main effect of condition here is due to the
28 inclusion of the Different condition – which we noted above is not necessary for this analysis,
29 but is included for completeness. When we remove the Different condition from the ANOVA,
30 we find no significant main effect of condition ($F_{(3,69)} = 1.05$, $p = 0.38$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$). These results
31 demonstrate that while we find the expected adaptation in RSC (i.e., Different $>$ Same), none of
32 the other conditions differed from each other, consistent with the RSC's tolerance to L/A
33 changes, as reported in our first analysis.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Given that neither length alone nor angle alone accounts for the observed responses to the
49 changes in both length and angle in either the PPA or OPA, we conducted a further analysis
50 probing how relative length and angle might combine to explain the response to shape changes in
51 scenes in these regions. Since we did not find any evidence of sensitivity to any shape changes in
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the RSC, we did not include this region in this analysis. We first normalized each shape-change
4 condition by subtracting the activation during from the Same condition (i.e., Length – Same,
5 Angle – Same, and L/A – Same) in each ROI of each participant, and then we examined how
6 responses to changes in each geometric property separately contributed to the overall response to
7 changes in both properties together (**Figure 4**). Using paired samples *t*-tests, we found that the
8 sum of the activation to the Length – Same and Angle – Same conditions was not significantly
9 different from the L/A – Same condition in either the PPA, ($t_{(23)} = 0.13, p = 0.90$, Cohen's $d =$
10 0.02) or the OPA ($t_{(23)} = 0.21, p = 0.83$, Cohen's $d = 0.05$), and that the Length – Same and
11 Angle – Same conditions were not significantly different from each other in either region (PPA:
12 $t_{(23)} = 0.05, p = 0.96$, Cohen's $d = 0.01$; OPA: $t_{(23)} = 0.64, p = 0.53$, Cohen's $d = 0.16$). These
13 findings suggest that an equal and additive effect of relative length and angle may underlie
14 sensitivity to shape changes involving both properties in the PPA and OPA. Future studies could
15 more specifically test for combinatorial effects of these geometric changes in the scene-selective
16 ROIs by parametrically varying the magnitude of change in each shape property.

37 *Object-selective cortex*

38 Our analyses of scene-selective ROIs demonstrated that the geometric information typically
39 associated with object recognition (i.e., relative length and angle) is represented in some regions
40 of scene-selective cortex when these properties are presented in the context of scenes. Given that
41 relative length and angle are classically associated with object recognition, does object-selective
42 cortex represent these properties in our stimuli? We tested whether and how object-selective
43 ROIs (LO and pFs) represent relative length and angle in pictures of objects and scenes.

44 First, we investigated *whether* the LO and pFs are sensitive to combined changes to
45 relative length and angle in pictures of objects (i.e., their preferred category) (**Figure 5A**). As
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

1
2
3 predicted, A 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA on the
4
5 average response between 6 s and 10 s revealed a significant main effect of Condition in both
6
7 ROIs (LO: $F_{(2,46)} = 4.07, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.15$, pFs: $F_{(2,38)} = 4.97, p < 0.01, \eta_p^2 = 0.21$), with a
8
9 greater response to the Different and L/A conditions compared to the Same condition in both
10
11 ROIs (main effect contrasts, all p values < 0.05 , all Cohen's d s > 0.65). There was no significant
12
13 difference between the Different and L/A conditions in either ROI (main effect contrasts, both p
14
15 values > 0.45 , both Cohen's d s < 0.25). These results demonstrate the expected fMRI adaptation
16
17 effect (i.e., Different $>$ Same) as well as a sensitivity to combined changes to relative length and
18
19 angle in pictures of objects (i.e., L/A $>$ Same) in both LO and pFs, consistent with a wealth of
20
21 evidence that object recognition depends in part on integrated representations of length and
22
23 angle. A 2 (ROI: LO, pFs) \times 3 (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA
24
25 revealed no significant ROI \times Condition interaction ($F_{(2,38)} = 1.04, p = 0.37, \eta_p^2 = 0.05$), thus
26
27 confirming that the LO and pFs represent the combined changes to length and angle relations in
28
29 objects in a similar way.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Next, we asked if the responses to L/A changes in the LO and pFs are specific to pictures
37
38 of objects, or if these ROIs respond to L/A changes in pictures of scenes as well. Interestingly, a
39
40 3-level (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant
41
42 main effect of Condition in both ROIs (LO: $F_{(2,46)} = 5.82, p < 0.01, \eta_p^2 = 0.20$, pFs: $F_{(2,38)} = 3.17,$
43
44 $p = 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.14$), with a greater response to the Different and L/A conditions compared to
45
46 the Same condition in both ROIs (main effect contrasts, all p values < 0.05 , all Cohen's d s $>$
47
48 0.70) (**Figure 5B**). There was no significant difference between the Different and L/A conditions
49
50 in either ROI (main effect contrasts, both p values > 0.45 , both Cohen's d s < 0.30). These results
51
52 demonstrate the expected fMRI adaptation effect (i.e., Different $>$ Same) as well as a sensitivity
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to combined changes to relative length and angle in pictures of scenes (i.e., L/A > Same) in LO
4 and pFs. A 2 (ROI: LO, pFs) x 3 (Condition: Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA
5 revealed no significant ROI x Condition interaction ($F_{(2,38)} = 1.91, p = 0.18, \eta_p^2 = 0.09$). LO and
6
7
8
9
10
11 pFs therefore appear to integrate relative length and angle in similar ways.

12
13 The above analysis suggests that these object-selective regions respond similarly to
14
15 objects and scenes. A 2 (ROI: LO, pFs) x 2 (Picture Type: Object, Scene) x 3 (Condition:
16
17 Different, L/A, Same) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of
18
19 condition in both ROIs ($F_{(1,19)} = 18.19, p < 0.001, \text{all } \eta_p^2 = 0.49$), demonstrating that the object
20
21 condition elicits a significantly greater response compared to the scene condition in LO and pFs,
22
23 consistent with object-selectivity in both ROIs. Further, we found no significant Picture Type x
24
25 Condition interaction ($F_{(2,36)} = 0.50, p = 0.61, \text{all } \eta_p^2 = 0.03$), demonstrating that the object-
26
27 selective ROIs represent changes to relative length and angle similarly regardless of whether
28
29 those changes occur in the context of objects or scenes. Therefore, we collapsed across objects
30
31 and scenes in each ROI for further analysis.

32
33
34
35
36 Since both the LO and pFs were sensitive to combined changes to relative length and
37
38 angle in pictures of objects and scenes, our second analysis investigated *how* relative length and
39
40 angle might contribute separately to the responses to changes in both properties across object-
41
42 selective cortex, observed in our first analysis. We found evidence that both types of information
43
44 in combination underlie sensitivity to L/A changes in LO: A 5-level (Condition: L/A, Length,
45
46 Angle, Same, Different) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of
47
48 Condition ($F_{(4,92)} = 7.54, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.25$), with a greater response to both the L/A and
49
50 Different conditions compared to the Same condition (main effect contrasts, both p 's < 0.001,
51
52 Cohen's d 's > 1.33), consistent with LO's sensitivity to L/A changes, as reported in our first
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analysis. Next, the response to the Length condition was not significantly different from the
4
5 Same condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.24$, Cohen's $d = 0.36$), and significantly different
6
7 from the L/A and Different conditions (main effect contrasts, both p -values < 0.05 , Cohen's d 's
8
9 > 0.74), while the response to the Angle condition was significantly different from the Same
10
11 condition (main effect contrast, $p < 0.01$, Cohen's $d = 0.96$), marginally different from the
12
13 Different condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.07$, Cohen's $d = 0.62$), and not significantly
14
15 different from the L/A condition (main effect contrast, $p = 0.21$, Cohen's $d = 0.40$). Finally, there
16
17 was no difference between the Length and Angle conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.19$,
18
19 Cohen's $d = 0.42$). Taken together, these results reveal that the responses to the Length and
20
21 Angle conditions were somewhere in between the L/A and Same conditions, suggesting that
22
23 integrated representations of relative length and angle underlie LO's sensitivity to shape in
24
25 objects and scenes.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 We also found evidence that both geometric properties in combination underlie
33
34 sensitivity to L/A changes in the pFs. A 5-level (Condition: L/A, Length, Angle, Same,
35
36 Different) repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of Condition ($F_{(4,76)} =$
37
38 4.34 , $p < 0.01$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.19$), with a greater response to both the L/A and Different conditions
39
40 compared to the Same condition (main effect contrasts, both p -values < 0.01 , Cohen's d 's $>$
41
42 1.00), consistent with the pFs's sensitivity to L/A changes, as reported in our first analysis. Next,
43
44 the response to the Length condition was marginally different from both the Same and Different
45
46 conditions (Same: main effect contrast, $p = 0.07$, Cohen's $d = 0.60$, Different: main effect
47
48 contrast, $p = 0.08$, Cohen's $d = 0.64$) and significantly different from the L/A condition (main
49
50 effect contrast, $p < 0.05$, Cohen's $d = 0.60$). The response to the Angle condition was
51
52 significantly different from the Same condition (main effect contrast, $p < 0.05$, Cohen's $d = 0.68$)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 but not significantly different from either the L/A or Different conditions (main effect contrasts,
4 both p -values > 0.23 , Cohen's d 's < 0.42). Crucially, however, there was no difference between
5 the Length and Angle conditions (main effect contrast, $p = 0.64$, Cohen's $d = 0.14$). Taken
6
7
8 together, these results reveal that the response to the Length and Angle conditions lie somewhere
9
10
11 between the L/A and Same conditions, suggesting an integrated response to relative length and
12
13
14 angle in the pFs.
15

16
17 Given that neither length alone nor angle alone drives the sensitivity to the combined
18 length and angle information in the LO and pFs, we conducted a further analysis probing how
19 these properties might combine to explain the response to shape changes in these regions (as
20 conducted above with scene-selective cortex) (**Figure 6**). Using paired samples t -tests, we first
21 found that the Length – Same and Angle – Same conditions were not significantly different from
22 each other in either region (LO: $t_{(23)} = 1.34$, $p = 0.19$, Cohen's $d = 0.31$; pFs: $t_{(19)} = 0.48$, $p =$
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
0.64, Cohen's $d = 0.09$). We also found that the sum of the activation to the Length – Same plus
Angle – Same condition was not significantly different from the L/A – Same condition in either
LO or pFs, (LO: $t_{(23)} = 0.21$, $p = 0.84$, Cohen's $d = 0.04$, pFs: $t_{(19)} = 0.79$, $p = 0.44$, Cohen's $d =$
0.14). These findings suggest that equal and additive effects of relative length and angle may
underlie sensitivity to the combined changes to both properties in the LO and pFs.

Discussion

The current study asked whether and how scene-selective cortical regions, especially the PPA,
represent shape information about the spatial layout of scenes, specifically relative length and
angle. The results demonstrate differential sensitivity to relative length and angle across three
scene-selective regions. Using an fMRI adaptation paradigm, we found that two scene-selective
regions, the PPA and the OPA, were sensitive to combined changes to relative length and angle

1
2
3 in the layout of scenes, while the RSC, another scene-selective region, was tolerant to such
4
5 changes. These results are specific to pictures of scenes, not to pictures of objects, and cannot be
6
7 explained by a feed-forward effect from earlier visual areas. Thus, these findings demonstrate
8
9 that the geometric properties typically associated with object recognition and categorization is
10
11 also used during some aspects of scene processing. Moreover, these findings, coupled with the
12
13 findings that the OPA and the RSC represent the sense and egocentric distance relations used for
14
15 navigation while the PPA does not (Dilks et al. 2011; Persichetti and Dilks 2016), suggest that
16
17 the three scene-selective ROIs each respond to different geometric properties of scenes.
18
19 Specifically, the PPA represents relations of length and angle, the RSC represents relations of
20
21 sense and egocentric distance, and the OPA represents all of this information.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Our finding that the PPA is sensitive to relative length and angle changes in scenes
28
29 dovetails with previous findings that the PPA represents the “shape” of a scene in terms of the
30
31 openness or the continuity of its spatial layout (Epstein and Kanwisher 1998; Kamps et al.
32
33 2016a; Park et al. 2011; Kravitz et al. 2011). The present findings, however, extend this work by
34
35 specifying that the shape sensitivity in PPA can be explained by a response to basic length and
36
37 angle relations among the extended surfaces in scenes. The suggested additive effect of relative
38
39 length and angle changes to scenes, moreover, indicates that the sensitivity to combined changes
40
41 to relative length and angle in the PPA depends on both properties roughly equally, perhaps by a
42
43 change in the aspect ratio of a scene, as relative length and angle changes both give rise to such a
44
45 shape change in planar geometry (Euclid 300 B.C.E./1990). Finally, our results also lend support
46
47 to the conjecture made by Walther and Shen (2014), based on behavioral data, that the PPA may
48
49 represent contour junction and contour length in a scene, which are both used for scene
50
51 categorization. Thus, the main role of the PPA in scene processing may not be for navigation
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 through a scene, but rather for scene categorization (e.g., recognizing a place as a kitchen or
4 beach), consistent with the classic evidence that shape analysis is central to object recognition
5 and categorization (e.g., Landau et al. 1992, 1998; Dehaene et al. 2006; Izard and Spelke 2009).
6
7
8
9

10 We also found that the OPA is sensitive to relative length and angle in pictures of scenes.
11 Here too the effect of each geometric property appeared to be equal and additive. Nevertheless,
12 we believe that detection of relative length and angle in the OPA may subserve a different role
13 than that of the PPA in scene processing. Given that the PPA is not sensitive to either sense or
14 egocentric distance (Dilks et al. 2011; Persichetti and Dilks 2016), both of which are crucial for
15 navigation (e.g., see Cheng and Newcombe 2005 and Spelke and Lee, 2012 for reviews), while
16 the OPA is sensitive to such information (Dilks et al. 2011; Persichetti and Dilks 2016), we
17 propose that the OPA may represent egocentric spatial information about local scene elements,
18 such as the distance and direction of boundaries and obstacles relative to the viewer (Julian et al.
19 2016), as well as the size and shape (e.g., relative lengths and angles) of boundaries and
20 obstacles in the service of active, visually guided navigation through the local environment
21 (Kamps et al. 2016a; Kamps et al. 2016b). During such visually guided navigation, navigators
22 must represent and update their location relative to the boundaries and obstacles in the immediate
23 surroundings, ostensibly requiring sensitivity to all of the types of geometric information shown
24 to be represented in the OPA, including sense, egocentric distance, relative length, and angle.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The RSC was the only scene-selective region found to be tolerant to relative length and
47 angle changes in scenes. While the RSC is sensitive to the intact versus fragmented 3D structure
48 of a scene (Kamps et al. 2016a) and to the presence of rectilinear rather than curvilinear figures
49 (Nasr and Tootell 2012), responses to the basic shape properties of a scene may not be directly
50 relevant to the putative function of the RSC. Specifically, several studies have shown that the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 RSC integrates representations of the local environment with representations of the broader
4
5 environment , encodes the locations of stable landmarks in the environment (Auger et al. 2012,
6
7 2015; Troiani et al. 2012), and tracks the location and heading direction of a navigator (Baumann
8
9 and Mattingley 2010; Epstein et al. 2007; Vass and Epstein 2013; Marchette et al. 2014). In
10
11 doing so, the RSC may underlie memory-guided navigation, situating the immediate
12
13 surroundings in a broader context and tracking the navigator's position relative to the stable,
14
15 enduring environment. Such a function need not directly represent the basic shape properties of
16
17 the local spatial layout that were tested here.
18
19
20
21

22 Finally, we examined whether and how object-selective regions of cortex represent shape
23
24 in the context of both objects and scenes. We found that both the LO and pFs are sensitive to
25
26 relative length and angle not only in the context of objects, but also in the context of scenes,
27
28 suggesting that the lateral occipital complex may support a secondary pathway for scene
29
30 processing, as has been proposed in prior work (e.g., MacEvoy and Epstein 2011; Epstein 2014).
31
32 We also found that both the LO and pFs may represent relative length and angle in an additive
33
34 fashion.
35
36
37
38

39 In conclusion, we have shown that the PPA is sensitive to the geometric properties
40
41 classically associated with object recognition and categorization, but only in the context of
42
43 scenes. Moreover, we have shown that the OPA is also sensitive to such changes, while the RSC
44
45 is tolerant to such changes. These findings, coupled with the fact that the PPA is not sensitive to
46
47 the geometric properties that guide navigation (i.e., sense and egocentric distance), while the
48
49 OPA is sensitive to those properties, suggest that PPA may be involved in scene categorization
50
51 and the OPA may be involved in visually guided navigation.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank the Facility for Education and Research in
4 Neuroscience (FERN) Imaging Center in the Department of Psychology, Emory University,
5 Atlanta, GA. This work was supported by Emory College, Emory University (DDD), National
6 Eye Institute grant T32 EY007092 (ASP), the Harvard University Mind, Brain, and Behavior
7 Initiative (MRD and ESS), the Center for Brains, Minds and Machines (NSF STC award CCF-
8 1231216), and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (MRD: DGE-
9 1144152; ASP: DGE-1444932).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Amunts K, Malikovic A, Mohlberg H, Schormann T, Zilles K. 2000. Brodmann's areas 17 and
6 18 brought into stereotaxic space-where and how variable? *NeuroImage*. 11:66–84.
- 7 Auger SD, Mullally SL, Maguire EA. 2012. Retrosplenial Cortex Codes for Permanent
8 Landmarks. *PLoS ONE*. 7:e43620.
- 9 Auger SD, Zeidman P, Maguire EA. 2015. A central role for the retrosplenial cortex in de novo
10 environmental learning. *eLife*. 4.
- 11 Baumann O, Mattingley JB. 2010. Medial parietal cortex encodes perceived heading direction in
12 humans. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*. 30:12897–12901.
- 13 Burock MA, Buckner RL, Woldorff MG, Rosen BR, Dale AM. 1998. Randomized event-related
14 experimental designs allow for extremely rapid presentation rates using functional MRI.
15 *Neuroreport*. 9:3737–3739.
- 16 Cheng K, Newcombe NS. 2005. Is there a geometric module for spatial orientation? Squaring
17 theory and evidence. *Psychon Bull Rev*. 12:1–23.
- 18 Dale AM, Greve DN, Burock MA. 1999. Stimulus sequences for event-related fMRI. *Hum Brain*
19 *Mapp*. 8:109–114.
- 20 Dehaene S, Izard V, Pica P, Spelke E. 2006. Core knowledge of geometry in an Amazonian
21 indigene group. *Science*. 311:381–384.
- 22 Dilks DD, Julian JB, Kubišius J, Spelke ES, Kanwisher N. 2011. Mirror-image sensitivity and
23 invariance in object and scene processing pathways. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*.
24 31:11305–11312.
- 25 Dilks DD, Julian JB, Paunov AM, Kanwisher N. 2013. The occipital place area is causally and
26 selectively involved in scene perception. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci*. 33:1331–1336a.
- 27 Epstein RA. 2014. Neural systems for visual scene recognition. In: *Scene Vision: Making Sense*
28 *of What We See*. MIT Press.
- 29 Epstein RA, Higgins JS, Jablonski K, Feiler AM. 2007. Visual Scene Processing in Familiar and
30 Unfamiliar Environments. *J Neurophysiol*. 97:3670–3683.
- 31 Epstein R, Kanwisher N. 1998. A cortical representation of the local visual environment. *Nature*.
32 392:598–601.
- 33 Euclid. 1990. *Great Books of the Western World: The thirteen books of Euclid's Elements. The*
34 *works of Archimedes, including the method. Introduction to arithmetic by Nicomachus (2*
35 *ed.)*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica. (Original work written 300 B.C.E.).
- 36 Ghaem O, Mellet E, Crivello F, Tzourio N, Mazoyer B, Berthoz A, Denis M. 1997. Mental
37 navigation along memorized routes activates the hippocampus, precuneus, and insula.
38 *Neuroreport*. 8:739–744.
- 39 Grill-Spector K, Kushnir T, Edelman S, Avidan G, Itzchak Y, Malach R. 1999. Differential
40 processing of objects under various viewing conditions in the human lateral occipital
41 complex. *Neuron*. 24:187–203.
- 42 Grill-Spector K, Kushnir T, Hendler T, Edelman S, Itzchak Y, Malach R. 1998. A sequence of
43 object-processing stages revealed by fMRI in the human occipital lobe. *Hum Brain*
44 *Mapp*. 6:316–328.
- 45 Grill-Spector K, Malach R. 2001. fMR-adaptation: a tool for studying the functional properties
46 of human cortical neurons. *Acta Psychol Amst*. 107:293–321.
- 47 Izard V, Spelke ES. 2009. Development of Sensitivity to Geometry in Visual Forms. *Hum Evol*.
48 23:213–248.
- 49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Janzen G, van Turenout M. 2004. Selective neural representation of objects relevant for
4 navigation. *Nat Neurosci.* 7:673–677.
- 5
6 Jenkinson M, Bannister P, Brady M, Smith S. 2002. Improved Optimization for the Robust and
7 Accurate Linear Registration and Motion Correction of Brain Images. *NeuroImage.*
8 17:825–841.
- 9
10 Julian JB, Ryan J, Hamilton RH, Epstein RA. 2016. The Occipital Place Area Is Causally
11 Involved in Representing Environmental Boundaries during Navigation. *Curr Biol CB.*
12 26:1104–1109.
- 13
14 Kamps FS, Julian JB, Kubilius J, Kanwisher N, Dilks DD. 2016. The occipital place area
15 represents the local elements of scenes. *NeuroImage.* 132:417–424.
- 16
17 Kamps FS, Lall V, Dilks DD. 2016. The occipital place area represents first-person perspective
18 motion information through scenes. *Cortex J Devoted Study Nerv Syst Behav.* 83:17–26.
- 19
20 Kourtzi Z, Kanwisher N. 2001. Representation of perceived object shape by the human lateral
21 occipital complex. *Science.* 293:1506–1509.
- 22
23 Kravitz DJ, Peng CS, Baker CI. 2011. Real-world scene representations in high-level visual
24 cortex: it's the spaces more than the places. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci.* 31:7322–
25 7333.
- 26
27 Landau B, Smith LB, Jones S. 1992. Syntactic context and the shape bias in children's and
28 adults' lexical learning. *J Mem Lang.* 31:807–825.
- 29
30 Landau B, Smith L, Jones S. 1998. Object shape, object function, and object name. *J Mem Lang.*
31 38:1–27.
- 32
33 Lee SA, Vallortigara G, Flore M, Spelke ES, Sovrano VA. 2013. Navigation by environmental
34 geometry: the use of zebrafish as a model. *J Exp Biol.* 216:3693–3699.
- 35
36 Lee SH, Kravitz DJ, Baker CI. 2012. Disentangling visual imagery and perception of real-world
37 objects. *Neuroimage.* 59:4064–4073.
- 38
39 MacEvoy SP, Epstein RA. 2011. Constructing scenes from objects in human occipitotemporal
40 cortex. *Nat Neurosci.* 14:1323–1329.
- 41
42 Maguire EA. 2001. The retrosplenial contribution to human navigation: a review of lesion and
43 neuroimaging findings. *Scand J Psychol.* 42:225–238.
- 44
45 Marchette SA, Vass LK, Ryan J, Epstein RA. 2014. Anchoring the neural compass: coding of
46 local spatial reference frames in human medial parietal lobe. *Nat Neurosci.* 17:1598–
47 1606.
- 48
49 Nasr S, Tootell RBH. 2012. A Cardinal Orientation Bias in Scene-Selective Visual Cortex. *J*
50 *Neurosci.* 32:14921–14926.
- 51
52 O'Keefe J, Burgess N. 1996. Geometric determinants of the place fields of hippocampal neurons.
53 *Nature.* 381:425–428.
- 54
55 Park S, Brady TF, Greene MR, Oliva A. 2011. Disentangling scene content from spatial
56 boundary: complementary roles for the parahippocampal place area and lateral occipital
57 complex in representing real-world scenes. *J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci.* 31:1333–
58 1340.
- 59
60 Persichetti AS, Dilks DD. 2016. Perceived egocentric distance sensitivity and invariance across
scene-selective cortex. *Cortex.* 77:155–163.
- Rauchs G, Orban P, Balteau E, Schmidt C, Degueldre C, Luxen A, Maquet P, Peigneux P. 2008.
Partially segregated neural networks for spatial and contextual memory in virtual
navigation. *Hippocampus.* 18:503–518.

- 1
2
3 Rosenbaum RS, Ziegler M, Winocur G, Grady CL, Moscovitch M. 2004. "I have often walked
4 down this street before": fMRI studies on the hippocampus and other structures during
5 mental navigation of an old environment. *Hippocampus*. 14:826–835.
- 6
7 Smith SM. 2002. Fast robust automated brain extraction. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 17:143–155.
- 8 Smith SM, Jenkinson M, Woolrich MW, Beckmann CF, Behrens TEJ, Johansen-Berg H,
9 Bannister PR, De Luca M, Drobnjak I, Flitney DE, Niazy RK, Saunders J, Vickers J,
10 Zhang Y, De Stefano N, Brady JM, Matthews PM. 2004. Advances in functional and
11 structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *NeuroImage*. 23 Suppl
12 1:S208–S219.
- 13
14 Spelke ES, Lee SA. 2012. Core systems of geometry in animal minds. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond*
15 *B Biol Sci*. 367:2784–2793.
- 16 Spelke E, Lee SA, Izard V. 2010. Beyond core knowledge: Natural geometry. *Cognitive*
17 *Science* 34(5):863-884.
- 18 Troiani V, Stigliani A, Smith ME, Epstein RA. 2012. Multiple Object Properties Drive Scene-
19 Selective Regions. *Cereb Cortex*. 24:883–897.
- 20
21 Vass LK, Epstein RA. 2013. Abstract Representations of Location and Facing Direction in the
22 Human Brain. *J Neurosci*. 33:6133–6142.
- 23
24 Walther DB, Shen D. 2014. Nonaccidental properties underlie human categorization of complex
25 natural scenes. *Psychol Sci*. 25:851–860.
- 26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Example scene stimuli from each condition (i.e., Same, Length and Angle changes, Different, Length changes only, Angle changes only). The object stimuli (bottom right corner) were presented in the same shape-change conditions as the scene stimuli. The scene and object stimuli never appeared together in the same trial.

Figure 2. Hemodynamic time courses (percent signal change) of three scene-selective regions of cortex, the PPA, the OPA, and the RSC to two completely different pictures of scenes (red line labeled “Different”), a scene picture followed by that same picture but with a change to both its relative length and angle properties (green line labeled “Length & Angle”), and the same picture of a scene presented twice (blue line labeled “Same”). Note that there is sensitivity to relative length and angle changes in both the PPA and the OPA, while the RSC is tolerant to such changes.

Figure 3. The average response (percent signal change) from 5 s to 9 s in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars), and Same (dark gray bars) conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the PPA and the OPA are sensitive to changes in relative length and angle, while the RSC is tolerant to such changes. (* indicates that the difference is significant at $p < 0.05$, # indicates that the difference is marginally significant at $p = 0.10$.)

Figure 4. The stacked responses to Length – Same (dark gray bar) and Angle – Same (striped bar) compared to the (Length and Angle) – Same (light gray bar) condition in the PPA and in the

1
2
3 OPA. We found a roughly equal and additive effect of relative length and angle changes on
4
5 responses in these regions.
6
7
8
9

10 **Figure 5.** A) The average response (percent signal change) to pictures of objects from 6 s to 10 s
11 in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars), and Same (dark gray bars)
12 conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the LO and pFs are sensitive to changes in relative
13 length and angle in pictures of objects. B) The average response (percent signal change) to
14 pictures of scenes from 6 s to 10 s in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars),
15 and Same (dark gray bars) conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the LO and pFs are
16 sensitive to changes in relative length and angle in pictures of scenes. (* indicates that the
17 difference is significant at $p < 0.05$.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Figure 6.** The stacked responses collapsed across object and scene conditions to Length – Same
33 (dark gray bar) and Angle – Same (striped bar) compared to the (Length and Angle) – Same
34 (light gray bar) condition in LO and in pFs. We found a roughly equal and additive effect of
35 relative length and angle changes on responses in LO and pFs.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Example scene stimuli from each condition (i.e., Same, Length and Angle changes, Different, Length changes only, Angle changes only). The object stimuli (bottom right corner) were presented in the same shape-change conditions as the scene stimuli. The scene and object stimuli never appeared together in the same trial.

Peer Review




Figure 2. Hemodynamic time courses (percent signal change) of three scene-selective regions of cortex, the PPA, the OPA, and the RSC to two completely different pictures of scenes (red line labeled "Different"), a scene picture followed by that same picture but with a change to both its relative length and angle properties (green line labeled "Length & Angle"), and the same picture of a scene presented twice (blue line labeled "Same"). Note that there is sensitivity to relative length and angle changes in both the PPA and the OPA, while the RSC is tolerant to such changes.




Figure 3. The average response (percent signal change) from 5 s to 9 s in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars), and Same (dark gray bars) conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the PPA and the OPA are sensitive to changes in relative length and angle, while the RSC is tolerant to such changes. (* indicates that the difference is significant at $p < 0.05$, # indicates that the difference is marginally significant at $p = 0.10$.)

Review




Figure 4. The stacked responses to Length - Same (dark gray bar) and Angle - Same (striped bar) compared to the (Length and Angle) - Same (light gray bar) condition in the PPA and in the OPA. We found a roughly equal and additive effect of relative length and angle changes on responses in these regions.




Figure 5. A) The average response (percent signal change) to pictures of objects from 6 s to 10 s in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars), and Same (dark gray bars) conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the LO and pFs are sensitive to changes in relative length and angle in pictures of objects. B) The average response (percent signal change) to pictures of scenes from 6 s to 10 s in the Different (white), Length and Angle (light gray bars), and Same (dark gray bars) conditions in each ROI, demonstrating that the LO and pFs are sensitive to changes in relative length and angle in pictures of scenes. (* indicates that the difference is significant at $p < 0.05$.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 6. The stacked responses collapsed across object and scene conditions to Length – Same (dark gray bar) and Angle – Same (striped bar) compared to the (Length and Angle) – Same (light gray bar) condition in LO and in pFs. We found a roughly equal and additive effect of relative length and angle changes on responses in LO and pFs.

Review